

May 15, 1975

SPEAKER: No I cannot do that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I don't think it's . . .

SPEAKER: I just asked for it to be held if someone desired. I am not in a position to do so, but there would be some opportunity to do this because of what happened in the other bill of separating the corporate from the individual income tax. If there is no one who wishes to do this, I can't. I don't try to stand here and tell anyone that I can. If somebody wishes to do so they will have an opportunity if this body concurs.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Members of the Legislature, fair is fair, rules are rules and they should be applied whether you like somebody or don't like somebody. Now I've watched the Lieutenant Governor turn the microphone off on Senator Keyes and it doesn't seem to bother anybody. Well it bothers me. It's up to him to speak out and defend himself. On an issue like this I can speak because I'm not speaking for Senator Keyes now, I'm speaking for what I think is right. I think there are certain powers the Speaker does have. I think when it comes to a bill where the Speaker has a personal interest in opposition, his position as Speaker should not allow him to do things which he could not do as an ordinary member of this body. By ordinary I mean one not cloaked with the powers of the Speaker. I think that his motion, in effect, is one to reconsider that bill. I don't think that it's appropriate for a person on the nonprevailing side to be allowed to do that. I don't think Senator Burbach is engaging in sculduggery because he explained why he did what he did. Nevertheless, I feel that his motion is out of order and that the Chair ought not to have accepted it. I think that the Chair ought to reverse itself and not accept the motion because it is one to reconsider.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Senator Chambers, the motion, technically, is not to reconsider. The motion that Senator Burbach made was to hold the bill till tomorrow morning.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. . . .

SENATOR SAVAGE: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, if it was agreed that bills were to be expedited then I don't see how we can then take a bill and say just hold it. Nobody should be able to just make a motion and say hold it. Hold it for what? Hold it because I want it to be held. There has to be a reason. The reason is to reconsider. Senator Burbach quite frankly and honestly told Senator Warner that his intent is to kill the bill. If we can't take the entire context of what has been said and see it as a motion to reconsider then I'd say a game is being played, maybe not intentionally, but that's what it amounts to. Now that I've tried to put it in prospective as I understand it, I don't have anything else to say on it.